

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of A.S.G., O.T.N.G., and C.S.H., Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,  
Petitioner-Appellee,

v

SHAQUITA MARIE GREENWOOD,  
Respondent-Appellant,

and

ONREE GRAHAM and ERNEST JARMAINE  
HAYWOOD a/k/a ERNEST HAYWOOD, SR.,  
Respondents.

UNPUBLISHED  
February 14, 2003

No. 238703  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 98-372050

---

In the Matter of C.S.H., Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,  
Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ERNEST JARMAINE HAYWOOD,  
Respondent-Appellant,

and

SHAQUITA MARIE GREENWOOD and ONREE  
GRAHAM,  
Respondents.

No. 238922  
LC No. 98-372050

---

Before: Murphy, P.J., and Cavanagh and Neff, JJ.

## MEMORANDUM.

In Docket No. 238703, respondent-appellant Shaquita Greenwood appeals the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). In Docket No. 238922, respondent-appellant Ernest Jarmaine Haywood appeals the same order terminating his parental rights to the minor child, C.S.H. We affirm.

The evidence established that respondent-appellant Greenwood had a long history of abusing marijuana and unstable housing. She did not attend drug treatment and did not regularly provide drug screens. She also tested positive for marijuana on several occasions. In addition to failing to resolve her substance abuse problem, respondent-appellant Greenwood did not provide verification that she was employed, and did not obtain suitable, independent housing. The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Sours Minors*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant Greenwood's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant Greenwood's parental rights to the children.

Respondent-appellant Greenwood also argues that her due process rights were violated when the trial court allowed the petitioner to amend the petition to include allegations of domestic violence. Respondent-appellant Greenwood has waived this issue by failing to properly present it in her statement of questions presented. *In re BKD*, 246 Mich App 212, 218; 631 NW2d 353 (2001). In any event, the issue is without merit because there was adequate notice and because the petition related to the proper care of the children and failure to rectify conditions of adjudication for which there was sufficient evidence, unrelated to domestic violence, supporting termination; therefore, any error was harmless. Next, contrary to respondent-appellant Greenwood's assertion to the contrary, there was evidence indicating that the Family Independence Agency made reasonable efforts towards reunification.

The evidence also established that respondent-appellant Haywood continued to use drugs and did not have a source of income. The trial court did not clearly err in finding that §§ 19b(3)(g) and (j) were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *Sours*, *supra* at 633; *Miller*, *supra* at 337. Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent appellant Haywood's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *Trejo*, *supra* at 356-357. Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant Haywood's parental rights to the child.

Affirmed.

/s/ William B. Murphy

/s/ Mark J. Cavanagh

/s/ Janet T. Neff